



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,449	08/17/2000	Nicholas David Butler	6169-179	6962

7590

08/26/2003

Gregory A Nelson
Quarles & Brady
222 Lakeview Avenue Fourth Floor
P O Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

LERNER, MARTIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/641,449

Applicant(s)

BUTLER ET AL.

Examiner

Martin Lerner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:

On line 3, the word "publication" should be replaced by "invention". The word "publication" could lead to confusion under patent practice in the United States, where there are both pre-grant publications and issued patents.

On line 12, "engines" should be —engine's—.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 1, line 24, "callers" should be —caller's—.

On page 2, line 7, "engines" should be —engine's—.

On page 2, lines 17 to 18, the phrase "as described in claim 1" should be deleted:

On page 3, line 7, "is" should be —are—.

On page 7, line 3, "hashtable" should be —hash table—.

On page 7, line 14, there should be a comma at the end of the line.

On page 17, line 33, there should be a comma before "the speech".

On page 19, line 7, there should be a period at the end of the sentence.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 6, “an application environment property” and “an environment property” should be –the environment property—. Any claim element previously recited should be preceded by an article “the” or “said” rather than “a” or “an”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Stanford et al.*

Regarding independent claim 1, *Stanford et al.* discloses an interactive voice response system, comprising:

“a plurality of speech technology modules, each module for receiving speech input from a user or producing speech output for a user” – context voice response files 400 and context prompt display files 410; context voice response files 400 are digital voice files stored for each respective recognition context; context prompt display files 410 are stored for each respective recognition context (column 8, lines 10 to 20: Figure 1);

“a voice application defining a plurality of interactions between a user and the speech technology modules” – user applications 110; user application programs 110 may include Executive Information Systems, Data Base Access via verbal query, software problem reporting systems, a telephone answering voice response unit, and a restaurant locator (column 10, lines 13 to 55: Figure 1);

“each interaction having a task property and an interaction environment property” – user applications can pre-register many contexts: a restaurant locator, a hard disk help desk, or software help desk can all pre-register multiple contexts hierarchically; each application will tell the recognition server to perform a recognition under a particular context for a particular speech stream, as appropriate for the task being executed (column 10, lines 42 to 55: Figure 1); a context is “a task property”; additionally, a supplemental dictionary 138 allows for the addition of the pronunciation of words not found in the base dictionary; in an application which provides information on area restaurants, a first context may be the type of restaurant the caller wants, e.g. French, Italian, Chinese and a second context once the type was established would be the restaurants in that particular category; in a restaurant help desk, restaurant name, particularly in foreign languages, but also unusual names for an American restaurant, will not be in the normal dictionary, and must be added to the task supplemental dictionary; these supplemental dictionaries contain local vocabulary which override the pronunciations in the base General English dictionary 132 (column 11, lines 4 to 23: Figure 1); supplemental dictionaries provide “an interaction environment property”; “a task property” involves a restaurant help desk with context voice response files 400 and

Art Unit: 2654

context prompt display files 410 for a restaurant help desk; “an interaction environment property” involves supplemental dictionaries 138 for word pronunciations in foreign languages;

“a speech technology selection module for selecting, for each interaction, one of the speech technology modules from the plurality of the modules to be used by the application according to the environment property of the interaction” – application program interface 108; the application program interface 108 offers recognition services which allow data stream control, context loading, and activation (column 8, lines 19 to 21: Figure 1); for a particular recognized speech string, recognition server 108 will output a corresponding response signal to the voice response output 402 over the response select 406; the response select 406 will identify which one of a plurality of stored digital voice responses are to be announced (column 12, lines 6 to 21: Figures 1 and 3); contexts (“a task property”) are associated with supplemental dictionaries 138 (“an environmental property of the interaction”), so recognition server 108 selects both contexts and supplemental dictionaries with response select 406.

Regarding claim 2, *Stanford et al.* further discloses:

“a plurality of parameter sets associated with each speech technology module” – mapping vectors 230 are stored along with the task recognition load module; applications arrange for the pre-storing of all tasks 240 and maps 230 they might require (column 13, line 62 to column 14, line 9: Figure 3);

“a parameter selection module for selecting one of the parameter sets for use with the selected speech technology module according to the environment property of

Art Unit: 2654

the interaction and the task property of the interaction" – when a particular application requires and gets the focus of the recognition engine for recognition with a particular task ("the task property of the interaction"), the requested task search network is engaged by a simple assignment of one of several base pointers (column 13, line 62 to column 14, line 9: Figure 3); implicitly, pointer maps 230 also provide access to supplemental dictionaries 138 ("the environment property of the interaction").

Regarding claim 5, *Stanford et al.* further discloses user application programs 110 may include Executive Information Systems, Data Base Access via verbal query, software problem reporting systems, a telephone answering voice response unit, and a restaurant locator (column 10, lines 13 to 55: Figure 1); the type of application service being requested, e.g. restaurant locator, is the "call type" requested by the user from his/her telephone.

Regarding claim 6, *Stanford et al.* further discloses supplemental dictionaries 138 contain local vocabulary which override the pronunciations in the base General English dictionary (column 11, lines 4 to 23: Figure 1); thus, the supplemental dictionaries 138 ("an application environment property") provide a pronunciation that "takes priority" over a pronunciation in the base General English dictionary 132.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2654

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stanford et al.* in view of *Lee et al.*

Stanford et al. suggests contexts may involve pronunciations of foreign languages, but does not expressly disclose an environment property of a language identifier and a regional identifier. However, *Lee et al.* teaches a related voice interactive system, where a language server 300 receives requests from a user, and directs the output of messages in the user selected language ("a language identifier"). (Column 5, Line 45 to Column 6, Line 32; Column 7, Lines 3 to 22: Figure 3) Additionally, *Lee et al.* provides a language property rule table for regional language variants including American English and British English ("a regional identifier"). (Column 6, Lines 33 to 45: Figure 3) *Lee et al.* suggests a messaging server language configuration method and apparatus that is efficient for dynamically configuring messaging servers for different languages without re-compiling the messaging program or re-writing the messages in another language. (Column 1, Line 20 to Column 2, Line 36) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include language identifiers and regional identifiers as taught by *Lee et al.* in the voice response system of *Stanford et al.* for the purpose of providing an efficient messaging system for different languages without re-writing messages in another language.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

Saylor et al. discloses related art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Lerner whose telephone number is (703) 308-9064. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.



ml
8/14/2003



Richemond Dorvil
Primary Examiner